



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,604	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-002100US	4746
51206 7590 08/20/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER MORRISON, JAY A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2168				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,604

Applicant(s)

KARIMISSETTY ET AL.

Examiner

JAY A. MORRISON

Art Unit

2168

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,14-17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-12,14-17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/27/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/27/2008 has been entered.

Remarks

2. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17 and 19-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 11-12, 14, 16-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertino et al. ('Bertino' hereinafter) ("Integrating XML and Databases", IEEE Internet Computing, July-August 2001, pages 84-88) in view of Pal et al. ('Pal' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0091188).

As per claim 1, Bertino teaches

A method of searching unstructured data stored in a database, the method comprising: (see page 84, first column, paragraphs 1-2)

storing unstructured data in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB) format; (document stored in database in Clob, page 86, first column, third paragraph)

receiving user input identifying one or more elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format as query elements; and obtaining information from the unstructured data stored in CLOB format for the corresponding element. (query unstructured documents, page 86, second column, second paragraph)

Bertino does not explicitly indicate "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format; generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format".

However, Pal discloses "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format;" (create secondary XML indexes, paragraph [0048], lines 1-4; paragraph [0050], lines 1-6) "generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the

unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format" (queries using secondary index path, paragraph [0051], lines 3-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino and Pal because using the steps of "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format; generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing fast and efficient searching of large objects in XML coded information. This gives the user the advantage of more efficient use of limited resources.

As per claim 2, Bertino teaches

the one or more queries specify at least one value and an operation that is to be performed on a user-identified element in the unstructured data. (page 85, first column, second paragraph)

As per claim 3, Bertino teaches

the one or more queries further include a start date and an end date. (query, page 86, first column, second paragraph; dates included in XML data, figure 1)

As per claim 5, Bertino teaches
the unstructured data comprises a well-formed XML document stored within a column of a database table. (page 86, first column, second paragraph)

As per claims 11-12 and 14,
These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and 5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 16-17 and 19,
These claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and 5 and are similarly rejected.

5. Claims 6-7, 9-10, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertino et al. ('Bertino' hereinafter) ("Integrating XML and Databases", IEEE Internet Computing, July-August 2001, pages 84-88) in view of Pal et al. ('Pal' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0091188) and further in view of Arora et al. ('Arora' hereinafter) (Patent Number 7,346,598).

As per claim 6,

Nether Bertino nor Pal explicitly indicate “XML fields of the unstructured data are filled with transaction data intercepted from a database transaction prior to committing the transaction based on a predefined mapping to multiple data sources”.

However, Arora discloses “XML fields of the unstructured data are filled with transaction data intercepted from a database transaction prior to committing the transaction based on a predefined mapping to multiple data sources” (column 7, lines 22-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino, Pal and Arora because using the steps of “XML fields of the unstructured data are filled with transaction data intercepted from a database transaction prior to committing the transaction based on a predefined mapping to multiple data sources” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by using XML as a means of simplifying the transferring and validating data and content. This gives the user the advantage of being able to share data across a myriad of different platforms.

As per claim 7,

Nether Bertino nor Pal explicitly indicate “the multiple data sources comprise multiple tables of a database”.

However, Arora discloses “the multiple data sources comprise multiple tables of a database” (column 9, lines 26-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino, Pal and Arora because using the steps of "the multiple data sources comprise multiple tables of a database" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by using XML as a means of simplifying the transferring and validating data and content. This gives the user the advantage of being able to share data across a myriad of different platforms.

As per claim 9, Bertino teaches

A method of searching XML data stored in a column of a database table in character large object (CLOB) format, the method comprising: (see page 84, first column, paragraphs 1-2)

storing the XML data in the column of the database table in CLOB format, wherein the XML data comprises a first plurality of XML elements that conform to a first data type definition (DTD); (document stored in database in Clob, page 86, first column, third paragraph)

receiving user input identifying one or more elements in the first and second plurality of XML elements as query elements; and obtaining information from the unstructured data stored in CLOB format for the corresponding element. (query unstructured documents, page 86, second column, second paragraph)

Bertino does not explicitly indicate "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements in the first" "plurality of XML elements identified as query

elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format; generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format".

However, Pal discloses "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements in the first" "plurality of XML elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format;" (create secondary XML indexes, paragraph [0048], lines 1-4; paragraph [0050], lines 1-6) "generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format" (queries using secondary index path, paragraph [0051], lines 3-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino and Pal because using the steps of "generating a plurality of database tables representing an intermediate index between each query element and at least one of the one or more elements in the first" "plurality of XML elements identified as query elements in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format; generating one or more queries on the unstructured data stored in CLOB format using the query elements; translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the

unstructured data stored in CLOB format" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing fast and efficient searching of large objects in XML coded information. This gives the user the advantage of more efficient use of limited resources.

Nether Bertino nor Pal explicitly indicate "and a second plurality of XML elements that conform to a second DTD", "and second plurality of XML elements".

However, Arora discloses "and a second plurality of XML elements that conform to a second DTD", "and second plurality of XML elements" (XML database schemas from multiple data providers, column 7, lines 22-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino, Pal and Arora because using the steps of "and a second plurality of XML elements that conform to a second DTD", "and second plurality of XML elements" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by using XML as a means of simplifying the transferring and validating data and content. This gives the user the advantage of being able to share data across a myriad of different platforms.

As per claim 10,

Nether Bertino nor Pal explicitly indicate "the first and second DTDs include first and second XML elements, respectively, that share a common name but represent different types of data; and wherein translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in

the unstructured data stored in CLOB format comprises translating a first query element that represents the first XML element and not the second XML element and a second query element that represents the second XML element and not the first XML element”.

However, Arora discloses “the first and second DTDs include first and second XML elements, respectively, that share a common name but represent different types of data; and wherein translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format comprises translating a first query element that represents the first XML element and not the second XML element and a second query element that represents the second XML element and not the first XML element” (column 8, lines 42-58; column 9, lines 19-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino, Pal and Arora because using the steps of “the first and second DTDs include first and second XML elements, respectively, that share a common name but represent different types of data; and wherein translating a query element associated with a query on the unstructured data based on the plurality of tables to a corresponding element in the unstructured data stored in CLOB format comprises translating a first query element that represents the first XML element and not the second XML element and a second query element that represents the second XML element and not the first XML element” would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by using XML as a means of simplifying the

transferring and validating data and content. This gives the user the advantage of being able to share data across a myriad of different platforms.

As per claims 15 and 20,

These claims are respectfully rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claim 6 and are similarly rejected.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bertino et al. ('Bertino' hereinafter) ("Integrating XML and Databases", IEEE Internet Computing, July-August 2001, pages 84-88) in view of Pal et al. ('Pal' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2005/0091188) and further in view of Campbell et al. ('Campbell' hereinafter) (Patent Number 6,856,970).

As per claim 8, Bertino teaches

the unstructured data (page 86, first column, second paragraph)

Neither Bertino nor Pal explicitly indicate "is part of an electronic record stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system".

However, Campbell discloses "is part of an electronic record stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system" (column 24, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bertino, Pal and Campbell because using the steps of "is part of an electronic record stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the system" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by ensuring that the data can be rebuilt from any point in time by tracking changes. This gives the user the advantage of being ensured that the data cannot be changed by mistake and not be recovered.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-17 and 19-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tim T. Vo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100